

## REMARKS

The application has been amended to correct minor informalities so as to place the application, as a whole, into a prima facie condition for allowance. Great care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new subject matter into the application as the result of the foregoing modifications.

In the Office Action dated October 5, 2005, the Examiner objected to Claim 10 under 37 CFR §1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claim. Accordingly, Applicant has deleted Claim 10.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 8 and 15, asserting that the term “said second slot” lacks proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claims 8 and 15 to clarify that the nib extends into said “generally square slot of said first bracket” to remove the antecedent basis concerns. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to Claims 8 and 15 be withdrawn, further consideration granted to the application and these claims passed to allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-11 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner stated that the cited sub combination features “said rail engager extends exterior of said second frame member” and “said slider being located exterior of said first frame member” failed to directly recite the corner lock elements relative to the frame member. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 17 to include the base claim limitations required by the Examiner and eliminate any indefiniteness. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under 35

U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn, that reconsideration be granted these claims and that they be passed to allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 11-13 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Silverman, U.S. Patent No. 6,845,593. The Examiner has also stated that Claims 5-9 and 14-15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to include all of the limitations of Claim 5, and has amended Claim 11 to include all of the limitations of Claim 14. Additionally, Applicant has deleted Claims 5 and 14. Accordingly, as Applicant has amended Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-13 and 15-17 as suggested by the Examiner to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and as the Examiner has stated that Claims 18-20 are allowable, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration be granted to Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-13, 15-20, and that the Examiner pass these claims to allowance.

The Examiner is respectfully urged to call the undersigned at 515-288-9263 to discuss the claims in an effort to reach a mutual agreement with respect to claim limitations in the present application which will be effective to define the patentable subject matter of the present invention if the present claims are not deemed to be adequate for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Brett J. Trout, Reg. No. 37,250  
516 Walnut  
Des Moines, IA 50309